TASK AREA 8: TOTAL WASTE STREAM REDUCTIONS IN ALL SECTORS.

Leader: David Dougherty/Jay Shepard
IWG Co-lead contact: Jay Shepard
Other volunteers: Jody Snyder, Tracey Farrell, Sego Jackson, Lisa Friend, Susan Robinson, Jim Jensen, Chris Martin, Suellen Mele

Task area 8 brainstorming from June 16, BW IWG Meeting:

- System of financial incentives for "light-weighting" of goods/materials
- Packaging reduction
- Work with retail/grocers to reduce food waste and on light-weighting of packaging
- Ban grass clippings in yard waste
- Charge for recycling (pay as you throw models)
- Water bottle fill stations instead of fountains
- Meaningful discussion in public of source reduction, reframe the issue
- Cultural shift to reinstall thrift as a cultural value
- Work with retailers to reduce packing, go carbon neutral, improve labeling (Great Britain "sell by" clock example)
- Create a "no junk mail list;" may need legislation for this
- Point of purchase education
- Better engage private industry, send better economic signals and incentives
- Engage material scientists in helping to find solutions

Waste Reduction Task Group Recommendations

1. **Collaborate with retailers to achieve consumer waste reduction**
   At least 50% of household wastes come through retailers. Retailers could be asked to help the state meet an overall 15% reduction goal, as described in AW-3. This would take the form of a memorandum of agreement with retailers and the governor to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals through packaging and product reduction strategies.

   An example of this is the “Glassrite Bottle Initiative” in the United Kingdom. Retailers worked with wine producers to lightweight wine bottles. For products that were imported, bulk wine was shipped and bottled in the UK.

   The result was reduced materials and energy use, equating to 788,229 metric tons of CO2 equivalent reduction per year.

   Pursuing a strategy like this could expand to other products and packages as well as pallet and other shipping materials reduction strategies. It could also include working with retailers to donate returned products to reuse organizations instead of disposing of them, and other waste reduction and education measures. Also, Washington could work with California and Oregon on regional efforts.

2. **Food Waste Reduction**
   Nearly one-third of the food that is purchased is thrown away. Food waste is a major factor in methane generation in landfills and a major portion of household budgets. “Love Food, Hate Waste” is a food waste reduction strategy developed in the United Kingdom. While it focuses information to consumers about food waste reduction strategies, it also engages retailers and producers in developing packaging for longer safe food storage and information about how to store food properly.

   Up to 400,000 MTCO2E could be eliminated if we reduced our in-state generated food wastes by half.

3. **Mixed Waste Paper Reduction Strategy**
   Nearly fourteen percent of disposed municipal solid waste consists of low-grade paper products such as junk mail, fast food packaging, telephone directories and magazines. Reducing this waste stream would realize several millions of MTCO2E reductions.

   Targeted legislation such as “no junk mail registers” or “telephone books by request only” could significantly reduce the amount of mixed waste paper generated.

4. **Construction and Demolition Waste Permit Deposit**
   Construction and Demolition wastes represent at least fourteen percent of the disposed municipal solid waste stream. There are also thousands of tons disposed in special purpose and limited use landfills. The exact GHG reduction potential is not know as the materials in C & D include everything from concrete and steel to paper, plastic and fiberglass. At this point, we can only speculate that the potential is significant.

   The State of California has initiated an innovative approach to reducing disposal of construction and demolition wastes. Local planning departments that issue building permits, require a C & D waste deposit. Within the construction plan, the contractor includes a waste management plan. Upon completion of the project, the contractor must demonstrate that at least 50% of the waste generated throughout the project was recycled. When documentation is submitted to the planning department and accepted, the deposit is returned. If not, the planning department retains the deposit and uses it to fund enforcement of the deposit program.

   Implementing a program like this in Washington could also be coupled with an effort to control sham recycling of C & D waste by requiring auditable evidence that the materials claimed to be recycled had in fact been recycled at legitimate facilities.

5. **Plastics Labeling Law Update**
   Chapter 70.95F RCW - Labeling of plastics requires that plastic bottles and rigid plastic containers be labeled with a resin type number, one through seven, with the chasing arrow recycling symbol. While many plastic products are labeled, they are not recycled and represent a contaminant in the plastics recycling stream. In addition, there are many plastic packages in use today, that were not in use when this law was passed, and do not carry any resin label. Lastly, there are many resin types and it is unknown if all resins used in packaging are recyclable and recycled.

   Plastics represent nearly twelve percent of the disposed municipal solid waste stream in Washington state. Nearly 120,000 MTCO2E could be reduced if all of the plastic from only three resin types were recycled in Washington.

   The plastic labeling law is ineffective at encouraging recycling of plastics. It sends the wrong message that all numbered resin types are recyclable in Washington.

   The law should be amended to require plastics manufacturers to create end use markets for the plastic resins they produce through a product stewardship model. Retailers can help this effort by requiring their suppliers to only package products that are in containers that are recycled in Washington State.

   This idea has nexus with concept number 1, in this task area, and with task area #4, Product Stewardship.

BIKE RACK OR REFER TO OTHER TASK GROUP

1. Product Stewardship approach for packaging associated with a “pay as you throw” disposal fee system. Producers of packaging finance the recycling and disposal of their packaging, as has been done in parts of Canada and Europe. This is a subject more suited to the Product Stewardship workgroup. (REFER TO TASK GROUP 4).

2. Implement a very high disposal surcharge that would cause waste generators to reduce waste and consider packaging and products purchased. A step in this direction could be achieved by bringing back the solid waste tax that was directed to waste prevention recycling infrastructure development. This could also tie into a funding mechanism for waste reduction and recycling and the work being done on system financing by the State Solid Waste Advisory Committee. (BIKE RACK)

3. Education – document how waste reduction could work, a point of purchase education program involving retailers (BIKE RACK)

4. Transport packaging reduction – pallets and shrink wrap (ROLL INTO RECOMMENDATION 1. ABOVE).

5. Improve the quality of the material stream by taxing non-recyclable packaging. Improving recycle-ability is waste reduction strategy. (ROLL INTO RECOMMENDATION 1. ABOVE).

6. Address reuse issues:
    a. usable products disposed
    b. planned obsolescence
    c. product durability
    d. retailers dispose of returned products.

    (REFER TO TASK GROUP 7 OR INCORPORATE INTO RECOMMENDATION 1. ABOVE).